

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

Applicants propose adding new Figs. 15-40 included in new drawing sheets attached hereto. No new matter has been added. Figs. 15-40 are supported by U.S. Provisional Application Nos. 60/258,882; 60/258,886; 60/258,887; and 60/258,888, which are incorporated by reference in and constitute a part of Applicants' disclosure, as originally filed.

**REMARKS**

In the non-final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Ott et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0150093); and claims 2 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ott et al. in view of Chow et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0126672).

By this Amendment, Applicants amend the title and abstract; the specification by way of substitute specification; claims 1-3 to improve form; and add new claims 4-30. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-30 are pending.

Applicants amend the previous title to read, "SYSTEMS AND METHODS FOR PROCESSING PACKETS" to improve form. Applicants replace the prior version of the Abstract with the attached new Abstract to improve form.

Applicants replace the previous specification with the attached substitute specification, which includes no new matter. For example, new paragraphs 214-351 are supported by U.S. Provisional Application Nos. 60/258,882; 60/258,886; 60/258,887; and 60/258,888, which are incorporated by reference in and constitute a part of Applicants' disclosure, as originally filed.

Applicants propose adding new Figs. 15-40 in the new drawing sheets attached hereto. No new matter has been added. New Figs. 15-40 are supported by U.S. Provisional Application Nos. 60/258,882; 60/258,886; 60/258,887; and 60/258,888, which are incorporated by reference in and constitute a part of Applicants' disclosure, as originally filed.

At page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by Ott et al. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

A proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires that a single reference teach every aspect of the claimed invention either expressly or impliedly. Any feature not directly taught

must be inherently present. In other words, the identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as contained in the claim. See M.P.E.P. § 2131. Ott et al. does not disclose or suggest the combination of features recited in claim 1.

Claim 1, for example, recites a combination of features of a processing device including an input interface for receiving data units containing header information of respective packets; a first module configurable to perform packet filtering based on the received data units; a second module configurable to perform traffic analysis based on the received data units; a third module configurable to perform load balancing based on the received data units; and a fourth module configurable to perform route lookups based on the received data units.

Ott et al. does not disclose or suggest the combination of features recited in claim 1. For example, Ott et al. does not disclose or suggest a second module configurable to perform traffic analysis based on the received data units. At page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Ott et al. teaches a method for routing data through a network that includes, receiving data packets having header information, an input port for receiving packets, a packet filtering device for routing the packets, a load manager for performing load balancing, and a route lookup operation for determining where to route the packets. However, the Examiner does not assert that Ott et al. teaches a second module configurable to perform traffic analysis based on the received data units. At page 3, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph of the Office Action, the Examiner admits that Ott et al. “is silent regarding . . . performing a traffic analysis metric . . . .”

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claim 1 is not anticipated by Ott et al. Thus, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

At page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 2 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Ott et al. in view of Chow et al. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Applicants submit that the grounds of rejection are improper. The present application has an effective filing date that predates the filing date of the Chow et al. document. As such, the Chow et al. document is not a proper reference under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Thus, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that new claims 4-30 are in condition for allowance. Support for claims 4-30 can be found throughout the substitute specification.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration of this application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1070 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

HARRITY & SNYDER, L.L.P.

By: 

Garth D. Richmond  
Reg. No. 43,044

13500 Random Hills Road, Suite 600  
Fairfax, Virginia 22030  
(571) 432-0800  
**Customer Number: 44987**  
Date: December 30, 2005

Attachments: As noted above